

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 110

March 22, 1995, 2:23 p.m.
Page S-4323 Temp. Record

LINE-ITEM VETO/Deficit Reduction and Tax Cuts

SUBJECT: Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1995 . . . S. 4. Coats motion to table the Feingold/Simon amendment No. 362 to the Dole substitute amendment No. 347.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 54-44

SYNOPSIS: Pertinent votes on this legislation include Nos. 109 and 111-115.

As reported, S. 4, the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 1995, will grant the President enhanced power to rescind spending in appropriations bills, and direct (generally entitlement) spending bills. Rescissions would remain in effect unless Congress passed a disapproval resolution and, if necessary, overrode a presidential veto by the usual two-thirds margin in both Houses.

The Dole substitute amendment would replace the provisions of S. 4 with provisions that would mandate the separate enrollment as bills of line items in all spending bills, in all bills containing new or expanded direct spending programs, and in all bills containing targeted tax benefits.

The Feingold/Simon amendment would express the sense of the Senate that reducing the Federal deficit should be one of the Nation's highest priorities, and that enacting an across-the-board or so-called middle class tax cut during the 104th Congress would hinder efforts to reduce the Federal deficit.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Coats moved to table the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Middle-income Americans deserve a tax cut. In 1950, a median-income family of four sent \$1 out of \$50 to Washington, D.C. In 1990 that same family of four sent \$1 out of \$4. When State and local taxes are figured in, more than 40 percent of an average family's income is seized by tax collectors. This year, "tax freedom day" will fall on May 15. Until that day, the average taxpayer is working to pay their annual taxes. Senators who tell us that we cannot give tax breaks because we have to reduce the deficit are

(See other side)

YEAS (54)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (46 or 87%)		Democrats (8 or 18%)	Republicans (7 or 13%)		Democrats (37 or 82%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Baucus	Campbell	Akaka	Hollings	Shelby ⁻²	Heflin ⁻²
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Biden	Chafee	Bingaman	Inouye		
Bennett	Inhofe	Bradley	Cohen	Boxer	Johnston		
Bond	Kempthorne	Kennedy	Jeffords	Breaux	Kerrey		
Brown	Kyl	Kohl	Kassebaum	Bryan	Kerry		
Burns	Lott	Lautenberg	Packwood	Bumpers	Leahy		
Coats	Lugar	Lieberman	Specter	Byrd	Levin		
Cochran	Mack	Rockefeller		Conrad	Mikulski		
Coverdell	McCain			Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	McConnell			Dodd	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Murkowski			Dorgan	Murray		
DeWine	Nickles			Exon	Nunn		
Dole	Pressler			Feingold	Pell		
Domenici	Roth			Feinstein	Pryor		
Faircloth	Santorum			Ford	Reid		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn	Robb		
Gorton	Smith			Graham	Sarbanes		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin	Simon		
Grams	Stevens				Wellstone		
Grassley	Thomas						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Hatfield	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business
2—Necessarily Absent
3—Illness
4—Other

SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

underestimating the harm that this oppressive taxation is causing. They are underestimating the need to cut taxes. We are not denying the need to cut the deficit as well. We agree with our colleagues that a lower deficit will lead to lower interest payments, thus helping average Americans greatly, and we will do our utmost to cut it as our first priority. Ironically, most of this amendment's supporters opposed the balanced budget amendment, the passage of which would have greatly lowered interest rates according to the two most prestigious economic forecasting firms in the country, the Wharton School and Data Resources, Inc. The defeat of the balanced budget amendment has undoubtedly made the difficult task of achieving both deficit reduction and tax relief even more daunting, but we will not shrink from the task. We will not agree to the Feingold/Simon amendment, thereby conceding defeat before we even try.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Our first priority is reducing the deficit and debt, which are lowering standards of living for average Americans and future generations. Any spending cuts or tax increases that are made should be used to reduce the deficit. Giving savings directly to the people in the form of tax cuts would not be as beneficial for two reasons. First, it would result in a greater accumulation of debt, and thus higher interest payments on that debt. Americans would suffer as a greater share of their Federal Government's revenues had to be spent on debt servicing. Second, increasing the U.S. debt and increasing the amount of money in the middle classes' hands would have an inflationary effect that could well result in a net loss of income in real terms for those Americans who have their taxes cut. We sympathize with our colleagues desire to cut taxes on the middle class, but at this time it would be a terrible mistake. We therefore oppose the motion to table the Feingold/Simon amendment.